

Application No.: 10/721026  
Docket No.: AD6547USCNT

Page 7

REMARKS

The Examiner has object to the Abstract of the Disclosure indicating that, inter alia, it is two paragraphs. Applicants' attorney is confused. In the PCT case from which this case has been filed, Applicants' attorney finds that the abstract contains only one paragraph. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended the Abstract to recite "Abstract of the Disclosure" and to reove the words "To provide". If further amendment is required, Applicants' attorney respectfully requests further elaboration from the Examiner.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 1 as improperly reciting the resistivity of the composition of the invention. Appropriate correction has been made.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2 and 16. As these claims have been incorporated into Claims 1 and 8, they are presently cancelled.

Item 5-6 (Novelty)

The examiner rejected claim 1-2, 5, 7-8, 10 and 14-16 as being anticipated by Ueda et al. The limitations of Claims 3 and 17 have been incorporated into Claims 1 and 8, respectively, thus overcoming the Examiner's rejection.

Items 9, 11 (Obviousness)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3 - 4, 11 and 17 - 18, and again 1 - 5 7 - 8 and 10 - 18 as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in light of Mukohyama. Despite the Examiner's arguments, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference that would make it obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the plasticizer of Mukohyama with the resin of Ueda et al. and to obtain a resin composition of the present invention having a surface resistivity of  $10^7$  to  $10^{13}$  ohms.

There is simply no motivation to combine the references other than the fact that both deal with polyester "resins." Mukohyama is directed strictly at obtaining good flame resistance and mechanical properties. Indeed, there is no

Application No.: 10/721026  
Docket No.: AD6547USCNT

Page 8

teaching whatever relating to the surface resistivity of the resins. Furthermore, there is no suggestion or teaching to use the plasticizer of Mukohyama in combination with a polyester amide. Accordingly, the examiner has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the present claims overcome the references.

Item 12

The Examiner has rejected Claim 6 as unpatentable over Ueda et al. in light of Mukohyama and further in light of JP 01163252. Applicants respectfully traverse. Even if the Examiner's argument for obviousness is upheld regarding the the Ueda and Mukohyama references, given the broad disclosure of the JP reference, there is no motivation to choose the specific composition of Applicants' Claim 1 for use as a transfer medium separating guide.

Item 13

Claims 1 - 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 14 - 18 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamanaka et al in view of Mukohyama. Like the previous rejections under items 9 and 11, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference that would make it obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the plasticizer of Mukohyama with the resin of Yamanaka et al. and to obtain a resin composition of the present invention having a surface resistivity of  $10^7$  to  $10^{13}$  ohms.

There is simply no motivation to combine the references other than the fact that both deal with polyester "resins."

The Examiner has discounted Applicant's 1.132 declaration. The declaration clearly shows that one skilled in the art would not use the teachings of the Mukohyama to obtain a resin having a surface resistivity as set forth in Applicants' Claim 1.

Application No.: 10/721026  
Docket No.: AD6547USCNT

Page 9

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



**ARNE R. JARNHOLM**  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT  
Registration No.: 30,396  
Telephone: (302) 992-2394  
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated: 8-09-05

T:\Patent Documents\Eng. Polymers\AD-65xx\AD-6547\AD6547 -CONT. - Updated Claims\Response to Non Final 5-25-05.doc